

Hon. Mr. LITTLE: What was the last year in which we collected the cannery licence?

Mr. FOUND: 1927 or 1928 was the last year of collection.

The CHAIRMAN: There was a big drop of revenue in 1927.

Mr. FOUND: There was a drop before we stopped collecting. A large number of people failed to pay, and we could not force them to pay when the case was going to the Privy Council, and we had to give back the fee to those who in good-faith had paid it.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: If you had the salmon fishery as your own, could it be made to pay?

Mr. FOUND: I think so, sir.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: That of course would be a drastic change in the present principle.

Mr. FOUND: It would do away with the principle of the public right of fishing in tidal waters—

Hon. Mr. McRAE: Do away with the public right? It would be under certain licences, wouldn't it?

Mr. FOUND: It would very greatly restrict the public right—

Hon. Mr. McRAE: Do you think this fishery could be carried on for the benefit of the state without loss of revenue?

Mr. FOUND: If it were carried on by the state, yes. Quite so.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: That brings up the question of whether the state should keep in mind economies in the industry, having regard to making a profit out of it for the state instead of making a contribution—a contribution which last year ran to \$575,000 for the fishing business on the Coast.

Mr. FOUND: That is so, Mr. Chairman. But isn't it only one side of the picture? What is the industry worth to the country?

Hon. Mr. KING: In 1933 the industry earned \$12,019,000.

Mr. FOUND: Ordinarily the fishing industry of British Columbia is worth \$25,000,000 a year to the country.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: The value to the country would not be reduced. The opportunity for employment might be reduced, but the value would be the same.

Mr. FOUND: As trade and commerce, yes.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: Trade and commerce would be the same.

Mr. FOUND: Except to the extent that you would limit fishing so that it would be carried on entirely from the viewpoint of economy instead of from enabling as many people as wish to take it up as a means of livelihood.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: Such a regulation would have a tendency to ensure the supply. Would you be better able to regulate it?

Mr. FOUND: It would make it simpler, of course.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: What I am coming up to, is this—I know it is not a popular view—that there are two groups of people in our country who think they have vested rights in this industry, namely the cannery men and the fishermen. My contention is that under normal conditions, when unemployment is not an issue, the fishery belongs to the state; and in view of the situation that has developed, if we are going to preserve the fishery, it looks to me as though the state has got to take it over and protect it on a basis that will ensure continuity; and, in the second place, stop the drain on the public treasury. Do you not think it can be done?

Mr. FOUND: Well, as I said before, if the Government were to go into the business of running the fisheries, or were to hand them over to some con-